

**REMARKS**

In view of the amendments to the claims, the claims and the application as a whole are believed to be in condition for allowance.

**Claims Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 112**

In the Detailed Action, the claims were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112.

In claim 1, line 3, the language "composed of" has been replaced by "comprising" which is believed to resolve the issue of open or closed language.

In claim 1, lines 5-8, the claim has been edited in a manner which is believed to overcome the grounds of rejection with respect thereto

In amended claims 6, 49 and 55 the "conductor" now refers to the antecedent.

Claims 50 and 56 were amended so that the additional conductor layer with reduced electrical lead resistance is clearly formed above the upper antiferromagnetic layer aside from the trackwidth.

Claims 57, 58 and 61 have been amended to eliminate the word "directly" which seems to have been unclear as the ground of rejection is understood. In line 15, the claim has been amended to make it clear that conductor to which reference has been made is an additional conductor.

Claims 59 and 60 were amended to be dependent reciting only the language distinguishing them from the claims upon which they are now dependent. The claims are believed to define a difference which is substantial, so that the claims are not believed to be subject to the double patenting ground of rejection.

Claim 61, which was on page 12 of the preliminary amendment has been canceled.

In view of the above amendments and the above remarks, the claims and the application as a whole are now believed to be in condition for allowance. Accordingly favorable action including allowance of the claims and the application as a whole are respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

By:   
Graham S. Jones, II, Attorney  
Reg. No. 20,429

Telephone 845-473-9118

FAX 845-485-9399